



Transmission Business Line (TBL)

MEETING MINUTES

Business Practices Technical Forum Meeting: Scheduling Practices Work Group January 27, 2003

Lori Hoffman convened the meeting at 1 pm and indicated that there were four topics on the agenda: Internal Constrained Paths, Short Term firm redirects for PTP schedules, California ISO supplemental market schedule changes within the hour, and the proposed Curtailment Procedure for the AC & DC interties.

Issue 9 - Internal Constrained Paths:

John Anasis of BPA TBL gave a presentation on Internal Constrained Paths and Zones. John wants to raise awareness of this issue, in particular among scheduling personnel. To review his presentation please click on [BPA-Transmission Business Line | Business | Business Practices Technical Forum](#), then click on “Internal Constrained Paths & Zones” under Work Group Documentation.

During the discussion on Path Utilization Factor (PUF) analysis, John indicated that it is helpful to understand ATC calculations, because a curtailment calculation is simply an ATC calculation ‘inside-out’; Shown below is the basic steps involved in calculating the Long Term Firm ATC on a path:

- Step 1: Determine the path limit;
- Step 2: Assess operating nomograms to determine the maximum amount of firm that will be offered, the difference between the path limit and the amount of firm offered is the Transmission Reliability Margin (TRM);
- Step 3: Determine what commitments already exist (i.e. PTP, NT or IR contracts) and apply them one by one to the base transmission system. Through superposition their combined effect can be assessed. The difference between the Firm TTC and the firm contracts is the firm ATC;
- Step 4: When a new request for service is received that is less than the posted ATC, the path ATC is decremented when the contract is to reflect the recent sale.

The assumption on how the Federal Generation resources will be allocated for NT and IR contracts in the base system is currently being worked out; PTP contracts are easier to model as PBL’s generator contract demands are known. There is an internal document being circulated within BPA that defines how to model the Federal Generation System in these types of Flow Based Studies, but it has not yet been released to the public.

The PUF analysis technique will soon be incorporated into the program that is run for the bumping market to allocate Short-Term Firm requests. *Eventually it will be applied to hourly transmission requests (John please confirm this as I thought I heard that but in retrospect am not*



Transmission Business Line (TBL)

sure if that will be case). When the analysis shifts to an hourly focus the ATC and Curtailment programs would consider actual schedules rather than contract reservations.

PGE was particularly interested to know if the effects of parallel, non-contract path flows would be taken into account when curtailments are carried out on constrained internal paths. The following example was discussed: if there was a new IPP connected to the PAUL bus serving load at the COVINGTON bus and if X% of that flow was found via a PUF analysis to first flow south to Portland before heading north to COVINGTON would that X% be subject to curtailment if the paths between PAUL and Portland became constrained? John indicated that if a schedule contributed to the constraint then it would be subject to curtailment.

Issue 10 - Short Term Firm Redirects:

John Anasis of BPA TBL led this discussion. This initiative will involve integrating the PUF analysis used to calculate Long Term ATC into the very complex program that allocates short-term firm requests. Given the complexity of the existing bumping market program it has taken 1.5 months to specify the requirements for the new program. In essence the program must do what the old bumping program did, but now also determine if short-term firm redirect requests can be accommodated and then make available to the market any capacity that was freed up as a result of a granted short-term firm redirect request. Development of the new program will start in March 2003.

Powerex (Gordon Dobson-Mack) wondered if it had a firm contract from Big Eddy to NOB whether it could redirect that request to a point on the Network. John Anasis indicated that they are planning that redirects would only apply to the same type of service (i.e. Intertie to Intertie, Network to Network). However, a Business Practice document on Short Term Firm Redirects will be posted within 10 days and comments are welcome.

PGE (Jerry Thale) was interested in having transmission options to serve load in Portland. He envisages having two viable options to go between say the BC/US border and Portland: Option 1: Short-term Firm Redirect from BC/US border direct to Portland; Option 2: Firm BC/US border to Northwest Market Hub then firm from Northwest Market Hub to Portland. PGE was then interested to know if the Northwest Market Hub concept could be applied to other points on the BPA system where two parties have firm rights to and from the same point. In essence, if the POD of the 1st leg was the same as the POR of the second leg then why not apply the same methodology that works for the Northwest Market Hub?

PGE (Jerry Thale) then cited John Day as a specific example: Portland has firm transmission from John Day to Portland and many parties, including Powerex have firm transmission to John Day. Having this flexibility would make it easier for PGE to justify renewing their long-term firm transmission from John Day to Portland.

ACTION ITEM: PGE (Jerry Thale) agreed to outline his proposal, and such proposal follows:



Transmission Business Line (TBL)

New Issue: L-Shaped Schedules: BPA should generalize its Northwest Hub Business Practice (Rev 12/01/00) to allow L-Shaped schedules when a delivering parties firm Point of Delivery matches the receiving parties firm Point of Receipt. As a minimum, the current business practice should be expanded to include the John Day/Big Eddy location where several parties possess long-term firm transmission into this location.

Generalization of this practice would augment the "Firm Redirects" work and provide additional flexibility for use of firm PTP transmission service. Assurance that schedules are "in balance" at these points could be automated and validated through use of the new tagging systems.

Issue 11 - California ISO supplemental market schedule changes within the hour:

Powerex (Mike Goodenough on behalf of Demetrios Fotiou) raised this issue as it was concerned about comparability. BPA TBL (Gloria Carter) stated that several years ago all customers were given the opportunity to pursue this option, however only BPA PBL went ahead with it. Furthermore, Gloria indicated that although PBL had installed equipment to perform dynamic scheduling with CISO, PBL was not currently submitting dynamic schedules. BPA TBL (John Anasis) indicated that an old posting regarding dynamic scheduling had been updated in Fall 2002 that explained the technical requirements for dynamic scheduling. A link to this document will be made available on the BPF website.

Issue 12 - Curtailments:

BPA TBL (Gloria Carter) presented a new Curtailment Procedure that should help limit the double-cutting of transmission schedules between BPA & CAISO. To view the procedure click on [BPA-Transmission Business Line | Business | Business Practices Technical Forum](#), then click on "TBL Curtailment Procedure" under Work Group Documentation. It is expected that this procedure will mitigate the impacts of intertie derates for the 1st and 2nd hours. Beyond the second hour curtailments based on reserved demand will be carried out. The procedure had also been presented to the Curtailment Work Group, however, Gloria wanted to make the Scheduling Work Group aware of progress on this issue. BPA TBL indicated that they would like to set up a similar procedure with BC Hydro.



Transmission Business Line (TBL)

Review of the Meeting Notes for January 16, 2003:

Issue 1 - Tagging:

This issue is closed for now, although, PP&L will review the item internally and decide if it wants to clarify the problem.

BPA TBL reminded customers of the Monthly Customer Call on 29 January 2003 at 10:30 am as Scheduling Timelines would be talked about during that call.

BPA TBL reminded customers that if E-tags go dead, then TBL needs to be called so they can determine if there is a problem to be fixed. BPA TBL (Gloria Carter) emphasized that TBL's real-time schedulers rely on its customers for feedback.

BPA TBL also encouraged customers to review the weekly customer scorecards that are sent out. If customers disagree with the scorecard then customer should follow up with TBL because the discrepancy may point to a problem that needs to be fixed.

Issue 3 – Account Building TBL elimination of “inactive” accounts

BPA TBL indicated that the number of accounts that RODs can handle was increased from 40,000 to 80,000 accounts so this should not be as much of a problem as it was a few years ago. Only accounts that were unused after 18 months would be deleted. Customers could get a list of their active and inactive accounts. BPA TBL also advised that it takes time and proper authority to delete an account, so eliminating accounts is not something that TBL would do on whim.

While there seemed to be general agreement to BPA TBL's suggestions, no formal proposal was presented and as a result a final agreement was discussed.

Issue 4 – Account Building after hours

Currently there are two account builders who work Monday to Friday. The delay in providing 24 hr/7 day account building services stems from the time it will take to train 10 staff to be able to build accounts. However, it is expected that all training will be complete by October 2003.

Once the real-time scheduling staff are trained, customers will still be asked to try and make as many of their requests for new accounts during normal business hours as possible to ensure that the real-time scheduling staff do not become overwhelmed with excess work.

Issue 5 – OASIS doesn't reflect long-term commitments

BPA TBL is working on this issue.

Issue 6 – Contract demand limits between TBL and transmission customer

Not discussed.

Issue 7 – Reconciliation Process behind billings



Transmission Business Line (TBL)

There is a reconciliation process available through the ISAS committee, but it is generally not invoked.

BPA TBL wants to work towards a process whereby there will only be a 60 days to resolve issues.

Issue 8 – Concern on system changes

Customers were encouraged to participate on the January 29, 2003 conference call. Generally there was concern about the idea that the E-tag would make the OASIS reservation.

Conclusion:

Customers were invited to submit other issues or concerns for the Scheduling Work Group via E-mail.

BPA TBL reminded customers that the next Big Group meeting is on February 7, 2003 from 09:00 – 16:00.

GDM

29 January 2003